

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in response to the Office Action dated October 1, 2003. The specification has been amended. Claims 1 to 4, 6, 8 to 10, 12, 14 to 18, and 20 to 25 have been amended. Claims 5 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Figures 3G, 5F and 7F have been amended to correctly correspond with the specification and are submitted herewith. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

A Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time to response to the Office Action is submitted herewith. A check in the amount of \$110.00 is submitted herewith to cover the cost of the one-month extension of time. Please charge deposit account number 02-1818 for any insufficiency of payment or credit any overpayment.

The Office Action indicated on the Office Action Summary that James E. Kaminkow is the first named inventor. The Applicant respectfully submits that the first named inventor is Joseph E. Kaminkow.

The Office Action rejected Claims 2, 10, 17, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that the Applicant employs the term "Boolean OR" to mean "a function that outputs the maximum value from a set of input values." The Office Action states that the accepted meaning is "a logical function that outputs the value of true if any input is true." The Office Action concludes that the term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections, nonetheless as discussed during the telephone interview, Applicant has amended certain of these claims to eliminate the "Boolean OR" and in place of that term to add language which defines that term. Specifically, Applicant has removed the term "Boolean" throughout the claims and has replaced the term with the function performed as described in the specification when referring to "Boolean." As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, such amendments should overcome these rejections.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1 to 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Thomas. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses these rejections because Thomas does not disclose at least one set of a plurality of values determined by a player's selection of a plurality of inputs. The claims with the new language which now clearly defines what is meant by "Boolean" are distinguished over Thomas without adding further elements as discussed during the telephone interview. As indicated by the Examiner during the telephone interview, such amendments should overcome these rejections.

Thomas relates to a reel game with a bonus round consisting of a fixed number of spins of the reels. For each bonus spin, the player accumulates an award, if any, based on the reel symbols displayed on one or may payline. Additionally, for each bonus spin, the player accumulates an award if any bonus collection symbol (i.e., COW or CASH COW symbols) is displayed on the reels, regardless of if the bonus collection symbol is displayed on a payline.

Amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a gaming device including a display device, a processor in communication with the display device, a plurality of inputs adapted to be displayed to a player by the display device and a plurality of values associated with the inputs. The gaming device also includes at least one set of a plurality of values determined by the player's selection of the inputs and at least one award generated by the processor by selecting at least one but not all of the plurality of values of the set.

The gaming device of Thomas generates an award based on the symbol combination appearing on one or more paylines of the reels for each bonus spin as well as any bonus collection symbol appearing on the reels. On the other hand, unlike Thomas, the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1 generates at least one award by the processor selecting at least one but not all of the plurality of values of the set of values determined by the player's selection of the inputs. That is, while the gaming device of Thomas randomly generates an award based on a number of bonus reel spins, Thomas does not disclose generating an award by determining a set of a plurality of values based on a player's selections and then selecting at least one but not

all of the values of the determined set of values to provide to the player. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1, Thomas does not generate an award by selecting at least one but not all of a plurality of values from a set of values determined by a player's selection of inputs.

Moreover, the Office Action states that the reel symbols of Thomas constitute inputs and the tables display the values associated with the reel symbols. However, unlike Thomas, the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1 includes at least one set of a plurality of values determined by the player's selection of the inputs. That is, unlike Thomas wherein the inputs (i.e., reel symbols) are randomly determined by the processor without any player interaction, in the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1, the inputs are determined by the player's selection. As Thomas does not disclose a player selecting inputs, Applicant respectfully submits that the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 to 4 depend directly or indirectly from amended Claim 1 and are also allowable for the reasons given with respect to amended Claim 1 and because of the additional features recited in these claims.

Amended independent Claim 6 is directed to a gaming device including a display device, a processor in communication with the display device, a plurality of inputs adapted to be displayed to a player by the display device and a plurality of values associated with the inputs. The gaming device also includes a plurality of sets of values, wherein each set includes a plurality of values and the sets are determined by the player's selection of the inputs. The gaming device further includes a plurality of awards generated by selecting a plurality of but not all of the values of the sets and a resulting award generated by the processor by performing at least one mathematical operation on the awards generated from the sets. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 6, Thomas does not generate a plurality of awards by selecting a plurality of but not all of the values of the sets determined by the player's selection of the inputs. Moreover, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 6, Thomas does not generate a resulting award

by performing at least one mathematical operation on the generated plurality of awards. For these reasons and the reasons described above with respect to amended independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 6 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 depends directly from amended Claim 6 and is also allowable for the reasons given with respect to amended Claim 6 and because of the additional features recited in this claim.

Amended independent Claim 8 is directed to a gaming device including a display device, a processor in communication with the display device, a plurality of inputs adapted to be displayed by the display device to a player and a plurality of values associated with the inputs. The gaming device also includes a plurality of sets of values, wherein each set includes a plurality of values and the sets are determined by the player's selection of the inputs. The gaming device further includes a plurality of awards generated by the processor by selecting a plurality of but not all of the values of the sets and a resulting award generated by the processor by selecting at least one but not all of the awards from the sets. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 8, Thomas does not generate a plurality of awards by selecting a plurality of but not all of the values of the sets determined by the player's selection of the inputs. Moreover, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 8, Thomas does not generate a resulting award by selecting at least one but not all of the awards from the sets. For these reasons and the reasons described above with respect to amended independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 8 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

Amended independent Claim 9 is directed to a gaming device including a display device, a processor in communication with the display device, a plurality of inputs adapted to be displayed to a player by the display device and a plurality of values associated with the inputs. The gaming device also includes a plurality of sets of values, wherein each set includes a plurality of values and the sets are determined by the player's selection of the inputs. The gaming device further includes a plurality of

awards generated by the processor by selecting at least one but not all of the values selected from a plurality of the different sets. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 9, Thomas does not generate a plurality of awards by selecting at least one but not all of the values selected from a plurality of the different sets. For this reason and the reasons described above with respect to amended independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 9 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

Claims 10 to 12 depend directly or indirectly from amended Claim 9 and are also allowable for the reasons given with respect to amended Claim 9 and because of the additional features recited in these claims.

Amended independent Claim 14 is directed to a gaming device including a display device, a processor in communication with the display device, a plurality of inputs adapted to be displayed to a player by the display device and a plurality of values associated with the inputs. The gaming device also includes a plurality of sets of values, wherein each set includes a plurality of values and the sets are determined by the player's selection of the inputs. The gaming device further includes a plurality of awards generated by the processor by selecting at least one but not all of the values selected from a plurality of the different sets and a resulting award generated by the processor by performing at least one mathematical operation to the plurality of awards from the sets. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 14, Thomas does not generate a plurality of awards by selecting at least one but not all of the values selected from a plurality of the different sets. Moreover, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 14, Thomas does not generate a resulting award by performing at least one mathematical operation to the plurality of awards from the sets. For these reasons and the reasons described above with respect to amended independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 14 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

Amended independent Claim 15 is directed to a gaming device including a display device, a processor in communication with the display device, a plurality of inputs adapted to be displayed to a player by the display device and a plurality of values associated with the inputs. The gaming device also includes a plurality of sets of values, wherein each set includes a plurality of values and the sets are determined by the player's selection of the inputs. The gaming device further includes a plurality of awards generated by the processor by selecting at least one but not all of a plurality of values selected from a plurality of the different sets and a resulting award generated by the processor by selecting at least one but not all of the plurality of awards from the sets. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 15, Thomas does not generate a plurality of awards by selecting at least one but not all of a plurality of values selected from a plurality of the different sets. Moreover, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 15, Thomas does not generate a resulting award by selecting at least one but not all of the plurality of awards from the sets. For these reasons and the reasons described above with respect to amended independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 15 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

Amended independent Claim 16 is directed to a gaming device including a display device, a processor in communication with the display device, a plurality of inputs adapted to be displayed to a player by the display device and a plurality of values associated with the inputs. The gaming device also includes a plurality of sets of values, wherein each set includes a plurality of values and the sets are determined by the player's selection of the inputs. The gaming device further includes a plurality of awards generated by the processor by performing at least one mathematical operation on the values of the sets and a resulting award generated by the processor by selecting at least one but not all of the plurality of awards from the sets. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 16, Thomas does not generate a plurality of awards by performing at least one mathematical operation on the values of the sets determined by the player's selection of

the inputs. Moreover, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 16, Thomas does not generate a resulting award by selecting at least one but not all of the plurality of awards generated from the sets. For these reasons and the reasons described above with respect to amended independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 16 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

Claim 17 depends directly from amended Claim 16 and is also allowable for the reasons given with respect to amended Claim 16 and because of the additional features recited in this claim.

Amended independent Claim 18 is directed to a gaming device including a display device, a processor in communication with the display device, a plurality of inputs adapted to be displayed to a player by the display device and a plurality of values associated with the inputs. The gaming device also includes a plurality of sets of values, wherein each set includes a plurality of values and the sets are determined by the player's selection of the inputs. The gaming device further includes a plurality of awards generated by the processor by performing a plurality of mathematical operations on values selected from different sets and a resulting award generated by the processor by selecting at least one but not all of the plurality of awards. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 18, Thomas does not generate a plurality of awards by performing a plurality of mathematical operations on the values selected from the different sets determined by the player's selection of the inputs. Moreover, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 18, Thomas does not generate a resulting award by selecting at least one but not all of the plurality of awards generated from the sets. For these reasons and the reasons described above with respect to amended independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 18 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

Claims 19 and 20 depend directly or indirectly from amended Claim 18 and are also allowable for the reasons given with respect to amended Claim 18 and because of the additional features recited in these claims.

Amended independent Claim 21 is directed to a gaming device including a display device and a processor which communicates with the display device. The processor and the display device are adapted to display a plurality of inputs, generate a plurality of values when a player picks the inputs, display the values in at least one set of a plurality of values and generate an award by selecting at least one but not all of the values in at least one set. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 21, Thomas does not generate an award by selecting a plurality of but not all of the values in at least one set of values. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 21 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 depends directly from amended Claim 21 and is also allowable for the reasons given with respect to amended Claim 21 and because of the additional features recited in this claim.

Amended independent Claim 23 is directed to a gaming device including a display device and a processor adapted to communicate with the display device. The display device and the processor are adapted to display a plurality of inputs, generate a plurality of values when a player picks the inputs, display the values in a plurality of different sets of values wherein each set includes a plurality of values, generate awards from the sets by performing at least one mathematical operation on values from the plurality of different sets and generate a resulting award by selecting at least one but not all of the awards from the plurality of different sets. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 23, Thomas does not generate awards from the sets by performing at least one mathematical operations on the values from the plurality of different sets. Moreover, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 23, Thomas does not generate a resulting award by selecting at least one but not all of the awards from the plurality of different sets. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 23 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

Claim 24 depends directly from amended Claim 23 and is also allowable for the reasons given with respect to amended Claim 23 and because of the additional features recited in this claim.


Amended independent Claim 25 is directed to a gaming device including a display device and a processor which communicates with the display device. The display device and the processor are adapted to display a plurality of inputs, generate a plurality of values when a player picks the inputs, display the values in a plurality of different sets of values wherein each set includes a plurality of values, generate awards from the sets by selecting at least one but not all of the values of the different sets and generate a resulting award by performing at least one mathematical operation on the awards from the plurality of different sets. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 25, Thomas does not generate awards from the sets by selecting at least one but not all of the values of the different sets. Moreover, unlike the gaming device of amended independent Claim 25, Thomas does not generate a resulting award by performing at least one mathematical operation on the awards from the plurality of different sets. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 25 is patentably distinguished over Thomas and in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Adam H. Masia

Reg. No. 35,602

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-
1135

Phone: (312) 807-4284

Dated: January 22, 2004